

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 48, No. 12

APRIL 18, 1955

WHOLE No. 1191

CONTENTS

A. G. MCKAY: A Survey of Recent Work on Aeschylus (concluded)	153
H. A. MUSURILLO, S. J.: Horace's Journey to Brundisium—Fact or Fiction?	159
REVIEWS	163
A H. Chase and H. Phillips, Jr., <i>A New Greek Reader</i> (Lord); R. Warner, <i>Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War</i> (Chambers); A. E. Avey, <i>Handbook in the History of Philosophy</i> (Long); Brief Notices.	
Books Received	168

A SURVEY OF RECENT WORK ON AESCHYLUS

(Continued from Vol. 48, No. 11, March 28, 1955)

Agamemnon

Eduard Fraenkel's monumental, encyclopaedic edition of *Agamemnon* (3 vols., Oxford 1950) marks definite progress in Aeschylean scholarship. Throughout the prolegomena, text, translation, critical apparatus, commentary (820 pages), and appendices, abundant critical scholarship is in evidence. The prose translation, confronting the conservative text, is admirably lucid and frequently instructive. Critical review of previous scholarship, attention to neglected work (e.g., William Sewell's translation of *Agamemnon*, published 1846) and suggestions for further study make this edition indispensable to serious students of the tragedian. See the reviews by C. A. Lynch, *CW* 45 (1952-53) 90, and R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *CR* 65 (1951) 147-151. Sir Frank Fletcher's *Notes to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus* (Oxford 1949), designed for use with Murray's *OCT* edition, offers valuable interpretative remarks and occasional discussion of textual problems.

H. L. Tracy's article "Dramatic Art in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*," *CJ* 47 (1951-52) 215-218, 251, lauds A.'s superb sense of theatre and dramatic technique in the *prologos* and portrayal of Clytaemnestra. B.M.W. Knox, *CP* 47 (1952) 17-25, submits that the parable of the Lion in

the House (Agamemnon 717-736, Murray) is a central reference-point for the recurrent lion image of the play. All the chief figures of the tragedy are linked, progressively, to the lion cub in various ways. The cycle of the parable is repeated in each generation of the House of Atreus. J. Drescher, *BFAC* 9 (1947) 1-31, treats the making of the *Agamemnon*, arguing that A. introduced two motifs into the Agamemnon legend, the principle of 'Nothing in excess' and the inevitability of crime's punishment. This realization helps explain the peculiarities of A.'s unique treatment of the legend.

The characterization of Agamemnon receives sensitive appraisal from F. R. Earp, *G & R* 19 (1950) 49-61. Earp points to Agamemnon's banal, conventional language contrasting with Clytaemnestra's bolder imagination. A.'s characterizations, as revealed in their language, require minute attention. A. Y. Campbell's synthetic study "The Fall of Paris: Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 374-398," in *Liverpool Annals of Archaeol. and Anthropol.* 28 (1948) 64-82, attacks corruptions, reconstructs the text, and recovers the troubled sequence of thought. C.'s suggestion of *diagnostheis* in place of *dikaiothesis* (393) misses the latter's consistency with the recurrent reference to *dikē* in the *Oresteia* (cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 27, note 2). A.'s readjustment of Agamemnon's murder from *Odyssey* 11) is explained by T. T. Duke, *CJ* 49

(1954) 325-328, as due to a desire on the dramatist's part to express his own philosophical and psychological probings as well as to make it conform with his ideas of dramaturgy. Duke assembles a formidable set of old traditions (closer to Mycenae than Homer) which Aeschylus may have known. The devious recesses of A.'s mind are as intractable as Vergil's. George Smets, "Le Trempe du bronze: Eschyle et les Barundi," in *Bull. de la classe des lettres de l'Acad. Roy. de Belgique* 35 (1949) 141-158, suggests that African practices help explain *Agamemnon* 612. H. Lloyd Jones, *CR* 66 (1952) 132-135, discusses the robes of Iphigeneia. Sir John Sheppard's verse translation, *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus* (Cambridge 1952), is a direct, vigorous version designed for dramatic presentation.

Choephoroe

Groeneboom's edition of *Choephoroi* (Groningen 1949) again illustrated his erudition and critical finesse, with modest treatment of the desperate text. Giuseppe Ammendola's comparable school edition *Eschilo, Le Coefore: Introduzione, testo e commento* (Firenze 1948) makes a brave attempt at clarification of the *loci desperati* and provides concise analysis of the psychology of the characters. The splendid *commos* receives exhaustive commentary and textual criticism from M. Untersteiner in "Le Coefore di Eschilo: Il commos (307-509)," *Dioniso* 12 (1949) 171-192 and 250-262. Particularly noteworthy are his remarks on the conflict of *dikai* and the idea of a man's survival through his children. F. M. Pontani examines textual problems in *Maia* 3 (1950) 182-208.

Eumenides

Groeneboom's final researches into the *Oresteia* have yielded a careful edition of *Eumenides* (Groningen 1952; see my review in *CW* 46 [1952-53] 140) that draws attention to the multiplicity of metaphors in an index and attempts to dispel historical attachments. F. Solmsen's chapter on *The Eumenides* in his *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca 1949) 178-224 provides a lucid interpretation of the play as a synthesis between the religious and political aspects of *dikē* although some of the inconsistencies may find less controversial explanation by dint of argument from the artistic side. S.'s chapter is a valuable critique of earlier theories and ably rebuts the sociological interpreters.

Pearl C. Wilson composed a note on *Eumen-*

ides 881-891, *CP* 42 (1947) 122-123, proposing that the sudden conversion of the Erinyes may be accounted for by Athena's reasonable appeal to their genuine concern for justice, a victory by moral suasion attended by a reconciliation. G. Italie's article "De Euripide Aeschylus imitatore," *Mnemosyne* 3 (1950) 177-182, shows that there are traces of Aeschylus (*Eumenides* 179-234) in the prologue to *Alcestis* and elsewhere. M. Bock treats the relation between the *Areopagitica* of Isocrates and A.'s *Eumenides* in *WJA* 4 (1949-50) 226-251. R. P. Winnington-Ingram's vivid article "Clytaemnestra and the Vote of Athena," *JHS* 68 (1948) 130-147, examines the sexual pattern of the *Oresteia*. Anomaly exists in the character of Clytaemnestra who is depicted as a woman with the mind and

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published weekly from mid-November for sixteen issues, except for any weeks in which there is an academic vacation. Volume 48 contains issues dated December 13 (1954); January 3, 10, 24, 31; February 14, 28; March 7, 14, 21, 28; April 18, 25; May 2, 9, 16 (1955).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of publication, Fordham University, 441 East Fordham Road, New York 58, N. Y.

General subscription price, \$3.75 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$4.25. Price to members of the C. A. A. S. \$3.25. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers, to subscribers, 20 cents, to others, 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If Affidavit to invoice is required, 60 cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to the *Classical Journal*) is included in the membership fee of the C. A. A. S.; whose members may also take *Classical Outlook*, *Classical Journal*, and *Classical Bulletin* at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer of the C. A. A. S., F. Gordon Stockin, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.

Reentered as second class matter December 14, 1950 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 14, 1950.

STAFF

EDITOR

Edward A. Robinson.....Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

William H. Stahl.....New York University, New York 53, N. Y.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Lionel Casson.....New York University, New York 3, N. Y.

Philip Mayerson.....New York University, New York 3, N. Y.

Martin Ostwald.....Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.

John F. Reilly.....Sacred Heart High School, Yonkers, N. Y.

counsel of a man. The 'masculinity' of Clytaemnestra is carefully considered together with the heredity theme. W.-I. accounts for Clytaemnestra's hatred for Agamemnon on the basis of envy of his person and male status. Marriage rights are regarded as central to the trilogy and the final proclamation by Athena fails to solve the social problem.

Oresteia (as a whole)

A brief but suggestive essay on the relations of the *Oresteia* to the pattern of Greek legal progress and the tradition of political thought to which Aeschylus belonged is found in P.B.R. Forbes' article "Law and Politics in the *Oresteia*," CR 62 (1948) 99-104. The political purpose of the *Oresteia* is assessed as exaltation of the Areopagus as symbol of eunomy. The trilogy reveals the gradual reconciliation of Family and Custom Law with Polis sovereignty and Law. A surface treatment of dramatic irony in the *Oresteia* appears in A. C. Sedgwick, *Of Irony, Especially in Drama* (Toronto 1949). Richmond Lattimore's translation of the *Oresteia* (Chicago 1953; see my review in *Phoenix* 7 [1953] 154-155) combines masterly versification with remarkable fidelity to the text. The Introduction offers brief background discussion of the poet (513/2 — 456/5 B.C.), his sources, the legend's evolution, and the central ideas and symbols of the trilogy.

Fragments; Satyr Plays

E. Lobel's periodic editions of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Parts XVIII and XX: London, Egypt Exploration Society, 1941, 1952) inevitably provoke discussion and reinterpretation of his deductions and treatment of the Aeschylean fragments. The most recent volumes include, under Aeschylus, fragments 2159-2164, and 2245-2257. Eduard Fraenkel's address "Aeschylus: New Texts and Old Problems," PBA 28 (1942) 237-261, gave spirited impulse to re-examination and interpretation of existing fragments. Since then the following articles have offered new ascriptions, careful editing, and exhaustive commentary: R. Cantarella, *I Nuovi frammenti eschilei di Ossirinco* (Naples 1948), offers especially good analysis of language and style as well as reasonable reconstructions; K. Latte, "De Nonnullis Papyris Oxyrrhynchiis," *Philologus* 97 (1948) 47-56, examines *Xantrai* (*P. Oxy.* 2164); E. Siegmann, "Die Neuen Aischylos-Bruchstücke," *Philologus* 97 (1948) 59-124, treats the two *Glaukos* plays (*P. Oxy.* 2159,

2160); François Lasserre "Les Xantrai d'Eschyle," *Mus. Helv.* 6 (1949) 140-156, dates his reconstruction to 490 B.C.; Mario Untersteiner greatly advanced our knowledge in "La Tetralogia eschilea degli Eolidi," *Dioniso* 13 (1950) 145-163, and *ibid.* 14 (1951) 19-45, examining and reconstructing *Athamas*, *Epigono* and *Theoroi* (tragic not satyric) with *Sisyphus Drepetes* (satyr play); S. Srebrny, "De Aeschyli Heraclidis," *Eos* 45 (1951) 41-56, adopts Zielinski's reconstruction, argues for change of scene from Trachis to Oeta, and dates the play between 467 and 458; B. A. van Groningen, in *Mnemosyne* 5 (1952) 214-223 examines *fr. 281 N.* H. J. Mette has issued a valuable addendum to his useful earlier (1939) edition, *Nachtrag zum Supplementum Aeschyleum* (Berlin 1949).

The Gyges Drama

E. Lobel's publication of "A Greek Historical Drama," PBA 35 (1949) 207-216, induced D. L. Page, *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge 1951) to suggest (14-15) that A. may have been influenced in his characterization of Agamemnon, Aegisthus, and Clytaemnestra by the portrayals of Candaules, Gyges, and the Lydian Queen in the Gyges tragedy. The general consensus of opinion is that the play is a late production; see discussion by T.B.L. Webster, *Diogenes* 5 (1954) 88-89, and R. Cantarella, "Il frammento di Ossirinco su Gige," *Dioniso* 15 (1952) 3-31. (See A. E. Raubitschek's discussion of this fragment, CW 48, No. 4 [Jan. 24, 1955].—Ed.).

Bruno Snell's comments on *Isthmiastai*, *Diktyoulkoi*, and *Myrmidons* have reappeared in English in *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought* (Transl. T. G. Rosenmeyer; Harvard 1953), chapter 3. Aeschylus as satyr playwright received comprehensive treatment from Victor Steffen in *Eos* 42 (1947) 148-176. The arguments of the satyr plays are advanced and valuable discussion ensues on Aeschylean language and metrics as found in the satyr dramas. Steffen also gave detailed attention to *Diktyoulkoi* in *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 3 (1949) 119-135; sympathetic reconstruction and commentary help illumine the *Net-Haulers* as an exceptional play. A. Setti, "Eschilo satirico," ASNP 17 (1948) 1-36, confines his discussion to this play. Peter Guggisberg in *Das Satyrspiel* (Zürich 1947) writes on the origin and development of satyric drama with attention to A. D. L. Page, *Select Papyri, III* (Loeb Classical Library 1950) provides useful discus-

sion and careful reproduction of the recovered fragments of Aeschylus. D. S. Robertson treats *P. Oxy.* 2256, fragment 9 (a) in *CR* 67 (1953) 79-80, and supposes that *Dike*, the speaker, ventures upon an account of the trial of Ares (by the Twelve Gods on the Areopagus?) for the murder of Halirrhothius.

Political Thought

Contemporary allusions in Greek tragedy have preoccupied scholars during the past decade and the trend has not abated. Probably the most ambitious attempts have been those of Davison and Baglio considered earlier. But almost equal ingenuity has been exercised in Post's interpretation, also noted above, of the *Seven Against Thebes* as propaganda for Pericles. Aeschylus' social consciousness and concern for the state and its institutions are well evidenced, but I find it hard to accept the *Seven* as a political manifesto for Pericles. Franz Stoessl's article "Aeschylus as a Political Thinker," *AJP* 73 (1952) 113-139, examines A.'s presentation of contemporary political problems and his attempts to find a general philosophical solution. A. becomes the supporter of Themistoclean foreign policy restricted to Europe (*Persae*) and hostile to Sparta (*Supplices*: ca. 476). PV reflects the struggle between Themistocles and Cimon, ending with Themistocles' ostracism ca. 474. The political reality behind the *Seven* was the struggle between Cimon and the exiled Themistocles. The *Oresteia* accepts democratic foreign policy but pleads for less radical domestic reforms. On each occasion A. as political thinker formulates and elucidates the political dilemma in a theoretical universal manner.

T.B.L. Webster metes out similar treatment in his *Political Interpretations in Greek Literature* (Manchester 1948; rev. by Mabel Lang in *AJP* 70 [1949] 446-447). The editors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists, III* (Princeton 1950) pp. 207, 321, attach some importance to political allusions in *Eumenides* and *Persae*. H. R. Butts' study, *The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama* (Iowa 1947; rev. by M. McLaren in *AJP* 73 [1952] 332-334) urges that A. created techniques for glorifying Athens to be used both as theatrical devices and as a means of gratifying his audience (17-55). B. apparently is persuaded that the deep moral and philosophical tone of the plays have superimposed an immediate political reference designed to secure a favorable verdict from the judges. J. Defradas, *REG* 65 (1952) x-xi, argues

A. reflects the practice of Athenian *exegetai* in *Choep.* 552ff., 899ff., 940, 118ff.; *Eum.* 595, 609ff.

Religious Thought

Solmsen's masterly *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca 1949; revs. by A. E. Raubitschek, *CW* 45 [1952-53] 70-72; W. C. Greene, *AJP* 71 [1950] 316-320) already mentioned, provides critical and original discussion of A.'s personal contribution to Greek religious thought, in particular his relation of evil to divine governance and justice. R. P. Winnington-Ingram's careful review, *Gnomon* 23 (1951) 414-421, emphasizes the central importance of *Peithô* in the eventual resolution and urges further study of this strikingly original conception and its political and philosophical implications. Solmsen also treated "Strata of Greek Religion in Aeschylus" in *HThR* 40 (1947) 211-226, drawing attention to the *theoi genethlioï*, *theoi poliouchoi* and *theoi enchorioi*. The conception of deity underwent a profound change in A. but the earlier primal functions are still evident. A.'s relations with Eleusis, his birthplace, and the Demeter cult occupied Henri Lebrun in "Eschyle et Déméter," *REG* 59-60 (1946-47) 28-45, and Pierre Amandry, "Eschyle et Eleusis," in *Mélanges Henri Gregoire (Ann. de l'Inst. de Phil. et d'Hist. Orient. et Slav.* 9 [1949]) 27-41. Lebrun argued that A.'s concern for the Demeter cult was neither fervent nor pious, as distinct from his Delphic predilection; Amandry replied that aside from such uncertain factors as mystical expressions and reflections of the Mysteries there is testimony within the plays and elsewhere that attest an Eleusinian influence upon the dramatist.

Heinrich Meyer-Benfey, *Religion und Kultur* (Hamburg 1948) 29-47, argued that the victory in the Persian wars gave tremendous impulse to A.'s perception of the righteousness of Zeus. R. Couffignal's article "Sur L'Eusebeia d'Eschyle," *Rech. de Science Relig.* 34 (1947) 328-346, emphasized the fervor of A. and his belief in the supernatural, invisible world, and his scrupulous respect for the divine laws. Kurt von Fritz examined the *Prometheia* in "Pandora, Prometheus and the Myth of the Ages," *Review of Religion* 11 (1946-47) 227-260. J.R.T. Pollard's enterprising article, "Birds in Aeschylus," *G & R* 17 (1948) 116-127, suggests that A. was acquainted with augury, as evidenced by references to the science in his plays; that the plentiful bird imagery indicates an interest in birds; that it is incorrect to posit that Prometheus' original form

was that of an eagle (or lammergeyer). Karl Reinhardt, *Aischylos als Regisseur und Theologe* (Bonn 1949; rev. by A. Schlesinger, *CW* 44 [1950-51] 123, and Rose in *CR* 64 [1950] 104-105), unlike Solmsen, finds a double aspect to Zeus: a cruel and a gracious side as evidenced in *Prometheus Bound* and *Prometheus Unbound* respectively. The reconciliation involves a change or realization on the part of Prometheus rather than on the part of Zeus.

Development in Zeus is regarded as un-Greek by W. Dekker in a useful article in *De Antieke Tragedie* (Leiden 1947). H. J. Rose's discussion of "Ghost Ritual in Aeschylus," *HThR* 43 (1950) 257-280, deduces that Aeschylus, an enlightened and pious representative of his age, nevertheless credited the spirits of the dead with approachable power (*Choephoroe* and *Persae*). The great dead, below divine rank but superior to the common level of mortality, demanded careful ritualistic behavior and invocation to secure their advice and potent assistance. E. T. Owen, *The Harmony of Aeschylus* (Toronto 1952) examines the extant plays to find a central, coherent Aeschylean credo. His analyses of the plays, particularly the *Oresteia*, are models of restraint in scholarship. Hans J. Baden, *Das Tragische: Die Erkenntnisse der griechischen Tragödie* (Berlin 1948; rev. by D. W. Lucas in *CR* 64 [1950] 103-104), treats man's relation to the Universe as expressed in Greek tragedy with startling defiance and scanty reference to previous treatments of this central problem in tragedy. A.'s attitude is regarded as one of resignation in the face of suffering, but of confidence in a divine plan that defies understanding. Zeus, in A.'s mind, was liable to exaltation as a unique, all-powerful deity; but B.'s sweeping generalizations, however true, lack sufficient argumentation. Gerhart Nebel, *Weltangst und Götterzorn* (Stuttgart 1951) examines *Persae*, *PV*, and *Oresteia* (13-168) with keen critical awareness of central moral and religious issues. The following relevant works were inaccessible: G. Calogero, "Sanofane, Eschilo, et la prima definizione dell' onnipotenza di Dio," in *Studi Mondolfo* (Bari 1950); and Elton M. Eeingenburg's *The Experience of Divine Anger in Greek Tragedy*. (Chicago, 1949; doctoral dissertation, on file with University of Chicago Library.)

Aeschylean Theatre; Art Representations

Indispensable for knowledge of the Athenian theatre, festivals, technical details of production, actors, costume, chorus, dance, and music (more work required here) are Sir Arthur Pickard-

Cambridge's two masterworks: *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford 1946) and *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (Oxford 1953). These works are the most authoritative comprehensive accounts available in English. Carlo Anti, *Teatri greci arcaici da Minosse a Pericle* (Padua 1947) advances a questionable thesis about a trapezoidal *cavea* and scenery in one plane; but his observations are always worth attention. W. B. Dinsmoor's detailed discussion of "The Athenian Theater of the Fifth Century," in *Studies Presented to David M. Robinson, I* (St. Louis 1951) 309-330, studies the theatre of the early fifth century (500-421 B.C.) which served A., Sophocles, and part of Euripides' productions. D. rejects Fiechter's and Anti's reconstructions in favor of a rehabilitation of Dörpfeld's old orchestra circle; he offers a new diameter measurement and lowers the date of the 'Cleisthenic' theatre to 500-497 B.C. Greek staging receives careful reconstruction and illustration by H. Bulle and H. Wirsing in *Szenenbilder zum griechischen Theater des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Berlin 1950): Wirsing based his reconstructions of scenery for five plays of A. on a rather elaborate scale. A. C. Schlesinger, *CP* 46 (1951) 32-33, argues that Aristotle's statement about the introduction of actors (*Poetics* 1449a16-19) gives no support to the theory of a strictly limited number of actors. K. Reinhardt, *Aischylos als Regisseur und Theologe* (Bern 1949), noted above, interprets the plays, in particular *PV* and *Oresteia*, with attention to staging and the notoriously startling and spectacular effects supposedly used by A.

Greek and South Italian vase paintings have been examined as evidence for stage settings and content of Greek tragedy and satyr plays. On the value of such investigation, see T. B. L. Webster "South Italian Vases and Attic Drama," *CQ* 42 (1948) 15-27, and A. W. Pickard-Cambridge's retort, *CQ* 43 (1949) 57, alleging that fourth century Italian vases are unreliable evidence for the structure of Athenian theatres in the fifth century (and for the content and action of plays). But Webster, in *Diogenes* 5 (1954) 89-90, has reiterated his contention that a sketch

Professor McKay's article is the ninth in the series of surveys of recent classical scholarship announced in *CW* 46 (1952-53) 261. Professor De Lacy's *Epicurus and Epicureanism* will appear in No. 13, April 25, 1955.

of the history of the production of Attic tragedy and satyr plays in Athens and South Italy could now be compiled on the basis of the recently edited vase material. In this connection, two recent studies have treated the Perseus tetralogy: Thalia P. Howe, "Illustrations to Aeschylus' Tetralogy on the Perseus Theme," in *AJA* 57 (1953) 269-275, and Christoph Clairmont, "Studies in Greek Mythology and Vase-painting, No. 3: *Danae and Perseus in Seriphos*," in *AJA* 57 (1953) 92-94. The former finds indications for the theme of the satyr play *Diktyoulkoi* on a vase dating ca. 490 B.C.; the latter finds the same theme on a red-figured pyxis (Beazley, *ARV* 605f.), though he prefers to credit the influence to a lyric or dithyrambic source. Further study along these lines seems desirable and must involve Henri Metzger's useful descriptive catalogue of fourth century Attic vase subjects, *Les Représentations dans la céramique attique du IV^e siècle* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 172 [Paris 1951]).

Generalia

Hans Bogner, *Der Tragische Gegensatz* (Heidelberg 1947; rev. by A. E. Raubitschek, *CP* 44 [1949] 131-132), advances the compelling thesis that Greek tragedy's significance lies in its repeated presentation of conflict between principles with equal validity; this is particularly true of A. Bogner suggests that conflicts within the turbulent democracy of A.'s lifetime partly account for its centrality in his plays. Orestes' dilemma offers splendid support for the 'religious' conflict: the 'political' aspect is discovered in the predicament of Pelasgus and Eteocles; the duel between the Erinyes and Apollo (with Orestes) illustrates that equally valid principles may be involved in the tragic life-and-death conflict and accordingly the problems which confronted the Athenian audience in *Supplices*, *Septem*, *PV*, and *Oresteia* were, in effect, timely problems set in legendary *milieux*.

Aeschylus is discussed briefly in several recent handbooks and popular texts: Moses Hadas, *A History of Greek Literature* (New York 1950) 79-84, a standard account; *id.*, *Ancilla to Classical Reading* (New York 1954), s.v. *Aeschylus*, a useful report on the dramatist's life; H. C. Baldry, *Greek Literature for the Modern Reader* (Cambridge 1951) 154-163, who accents A.'s powerful and majestic language; D. W. Lucas, *The Greek Tragic Poets: Their Contribution to Western Life and Thought* (Boston 1952) 51-105, who misses the absorbing problem of A.'s

profound religious and theological perception; and F. L. Lucas, *Greek Drama for Everyman* (Cambridge 1954), a companion to the preceding, with translations into verse of *Prometheus Bound*, *Agamemnon*, and sections from other plays. Ingenious remarks and polemical commentary frequently brighten the pages. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge's article "Aeschylus" in *OCD* is clear, concise, and authoritative. Antonio Madalena's *Interpretazioni Eschilee* (Turin 1951) has little to offer since it generally skirts crucial passages and central problems in favor of an oft-repeated running commentary on the plays. M.'s attention to pity or compassion as an important *leitmotif* in the plays helps redeem an otherwise unimpressive account. B. A. van Groningen, *Vier Voordrachten over de Griekse Tragedie* (Leiden 1949), provides general discussion of Greek tragedy; the essay on "Greek Tragedy as a Mirror of Culture" merits expansion. Mario Untersteiner, "La Poetica di Eschilo" *Dioniso* 15 (1952) 312-330, investigates the plays to discover A.'s conception of his dramatic art.

Influence

Several studies have outlined recent re-interpretations of classical myth with attention to A.'s plays. These are, without comment: F. Jouan, "Le Retour au mythe grec dans le théâtre français contemporain," in *Bulletin de l'Assoc. Guillaume Budé*, 1952.2 62-79; Gilbert Highet, *The Classical Tradition* (Oxford 1949), chapter 15; Bennett Weaver, "Prometheus Bound and Prometheus Unbound" (*Aeschylus* and *Shelley*) in *PMLA* 64 (1949) 115-133. R. A. Brower's article "Seven Agamemnons," in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 8 (1947) 406-430, studies six translations of *Agamemnons* (*Aeschylus'* and *Seneca's*) as clues to the nature of poetry. G. Méautis, "Thucydide et Eschyle," in *Mélanges Charles Picard* (*RA* 31-32 [1949]) 716-719, traces a connection in thought without influence. V. Ussani Jr., "Eschilo e il libro II dell' *Eneide*," *Maia* 3 (1950) 237-254, suggests that Vergil's epic technique bears analogy with A.'s dramatic art, and that Vergil composed the messenger report of Troy's destruction on Aeschylean models.

Conclusion

Eduard Fraenkel's remarks in *PBA* 28 (1942) 250-251 regarding the future of Aeschylean studies merits partial repetition:

What seems to me at present most urgently needed in the field of Aeschylean studies, is not

a new creed, whether Marxist or another, applied to, or enforced upon, the work of the poet, but observation, more observation, and even more observation. We may begin with observing words, their meaning, their structure, and their order, and end with observing characteristic habits of the poet's mind in shaping dramatic characters, bringing about a tragic tension, and revealing his religious convictions.

ALEXANDER G. MCKAY

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO

HORACE'S JOURNEY TO BRUNDISIUM — FACT OR FICTION?

It is a curious fact that, despite the vast amount of scholarship that has grown up around Horace's *Iter Brundisium* (*Serm. 1.5*), we seem to be no nearer to a solution of many of the problems which it raises.¹ Even if we pass over, for example, the minor question of the identification of some of the places mentioned, there is the problem—admittedly not an important one

1. See the bibliographies in Schanz-Hosius II (1935) 119, and N. I. Herescu, *Bibliographie de la littérature latine* (Paris 1943) 169 ff.; to these should be added the following useful editions of the Satires: J. C. Rolfe (Boston 1901; rev. ed. 1935); J. H. Kirkland (Boston 1902); E. P. Morris (New York 1909); B. J. Hayes and F. G. Plaistowe (London: University Tutorial Press: n.d.); A. Rostagni (Turin 1948). Add also E. S. Shuckburgh, *Augustus* (London 1905), esp. 99 ff.; Alfred Noyes, *Horace: a Portrait* (New York 1947); H. D. Sedgwick, *Horace: A Biography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), esp. 34 ff.; W. Wili, *Horaz und die augusteische Kultur* (Basle 1948); A. Rostagni, *Storia della letteratura latina* (2 vols.; Bologna 1949-52) II. 76 ff. A good Horatian bibliography can be found in *Introduzione alla Filologia classica* (Milan 1951) 572 ff.

On the *Iter Brundisium* in particular, see E. Desjardins, *RPh* 2 (1878) 144 ff.; A. Bischoff, *De itinere Horatii Brundisino* (Landau 1880); H. Düntzer, *Philologus* 55 (1896) 416 ff.; A. Cartault, *Etude sur les satires d'Horace* (Paris 1899) 51 f.; J. Gow, *CR* 15 (1901) 117 (with a note by E. Shuckburgh, *ibid.*, 166); J. Dorsch, *Mit Horaz vom Rom nach Brindisi* (Prague 1904); G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace* (Madison 1920) 306 ff.; L. Herrmann, *REL* 9 (1931) 273 ff.; A. Calderini, "Viaggi e avventure di viaggi dei tempi di Orazio," *Le Vie d'Italia* 41 (1935) 498 ff.; R. Latsch, *Die Chronologie der Satiren und Epoden des Horaz auf entwicklungsgeschichtlicher Grundlage* (Würzburg 1936), esp. 32 ff. (an extremely superficial treatment of the problem); L. Illuminati *La Satura odepotica latina* (Milan 1938), esp. liii f. Extremely unsatisfactory is the paper by Helena Matakiewicz, "De itineris genere litterario," *Eos* 32 (1929), 229 ff.

—of determining the exact number of days Horace's party required for the journey. And even on this point, though many plodding scholars (more stalwart than myself) have retraced Horace's footsteps, no agreement has ever been reached. Some, like Orelli, have allowed for as many as seventeen days; most calculate fifteen days (e.g., Müller, Krüger, MacLeane, Palmer, Dillenburger, Kiessling-Heinze, Calderini, Wili); some would compress the trip into thirteen days (Desjardins, Lejay, Rolfe); and Gibbon saw no reason why it should take more than twelve.² My own view is that the slowest pace of all fits in better with the mood of the satire. But on this point one cannot but feel that, in the absence of any certain clue from the text itself, doubt must remain.

Much more important, however, and perhaps more capable of solution is the question of the dramatic date of the poem. In the past, scholars have based their solutions on an identification, from our historical sources, of the important diplomatic mission (28: *missi magnis de rebus uterque*) in which Horace, indirectly, was involved. Now so far as I am aware, only three historic occasions have ever been seriously considered:

- i. The Pact of Brundisium (early October, 40 B.C.),
- ii. Maecenas' mission to Athens (Autumn/Winter, 38 B.C.),
- iii. The Peace of Tarentum (early Spring, 37 B.C.).

Let us consider each of these occasions in order.

2. For Gibbon's essay on Horace's journey (written by him in French at Lausanne in 1763), see his *Recueil de mes observations*. No. iii in *Miscellaneous Works of Edward Gibbon*, ed. by John Lord Sheffield (3 vols.; Dublin 1796) III, 87 ff. Gibbon, who seems familiar with the country, had Horace and his party arrive at Beneventum on the sixth day, but he conceded that the speed of the journey ultimately depended on the urgency of Maecenas' diplomatic mission. After they leave Beneventum, he notes, "we meet with little but obscurity in this part of the route . . . Father Sanadon [the Jesuit classicist, Noel Sanadon, d. 1733] suspects Horace of having lost his way among his native mountains" (*loc. cit.*, p. 91). Gibbon expresses his supreme disappointment in the satire and wonders how a man of taste could think the details of the journey worth writing about: "the maxim that every thing in great men is interesting applies only to their minds and ought not to be extended to their bodies" (p. 94). And finally, by way of excusing Horace, Gibbon suggests that the poem was perhaps "written to convince his enemies that his thoughts and occupations on the road were far from being of a serious or political nature" (*ibid.*). This is a point of view which should be seriously considered in any attempt to probe the mystery of the *Fifth Satire*.

I. The Pact of Brundisium (early October, 40).³ This was the great reconciliation which was to result in the marriage of Antony and Octavia and in a fresh partition of power among the Triumvirs. The war against Sextus Pompeius was henceforward to be their common care, and Octavian, on his part, consented to an amnesty of all those who had joined Antony from the armies of Brutus and Cassius. Now if we may rely on the account of the meeting as given by Appian (BC 5.64), the delegates chosen by Octavian's soldiers were Asinius Pollio as a friend of Antony, C. Maecenas as a confidant of Octavian, and L. Cocceius Nerva as a man who would be acceptable to both sides. It is interesting to note that the only difference between Horace's delegation and Appian's is that instead of Asinius Pollio as Antony's friend, Horace has C. Fonteius Capito. At any rate, most scholars (but not, e.g. L. Desprez and E. Shuckburgh) tend to rule out this occasion as the historical basis of Horace's satire, obviously because of the date of the pact; for Horace could hardly have become intimate with Maecenas much before the year 38 (or just possibly towards the close of 39).⁴ And Horace himself seems to suggest that the journey of *Serm. 1.5* was not the first diplomatic mission of this nature (29: *aversos soliti componere amicos*). But the presumption all along has been that all the details that Horace gives us are to be taken as belonging to a single historical context — and this is precisely the position which I propose to question.

II. Maecenas' Mission to Athens (Autumn/Winter, 38 B.C.).⁵ Antony was at this time residing with Octavia at Athens, and Maecenas was dispatched from Rome to confer with him on Octavian's behalf and to solicit his support once again against Sextus Pompeius. The presump-

tion, of course, is that Maecenas would sail from Brundisium and would be accompanied, at least part of the way, by his *docta cohors*. One difficulty, however, is that Appian, our only source for this occasion, makes no mention of any other delegates; and since Maecenas' mission was not in the nature of a reconciliation, the other delegates would not strictly be necessary. At any rate, chiefly because of the conviction that the journey described by Horace was made in the autumn or the winter, many scholars have accepted Maecenas' Athenian mission as the occasion of the satire: so Schütz, Palmer, Cartault, Kirkland, Morris, Fairclough, Herrmann, Calderini, Illuminati, and, with some hesitation, Wickham and Rolfe. On this view, of course, the assumption is that Horace accompanied Maecenas only as far as Brundisium (*finis chartaeque viaeque*); Maecenas and the other delegates continue on to Athens, but this detail could, in the poem, be discreetly passed over in silence.

III. The Peace of Tarentum (early Spring, 37 B.C.).⁶ Here the sources are substantially in agreement that Antony and Octavian were reconciled largely through the mediation of Octavia. Although Dio mentions no delegates by name, he does say that the Triumvirs at first presented their mutual grievances "through friends"; and Plutarch gives us a charming picture of Octavia, who was with child, running on ahead to meet her brother as he was approaching Tarentum in the company of Maecenas and Agrippa. But how is such a meeting to be reconciled with Horace's account? There is no reason to suppose that Octavian or his party went first to Brundisium; and it would have been odd for Maecenas (and Horace, if he were with him) to go to Tarentum in such a round-about way by the Via Minucia. It is, of course, suggested by Plutarch (who differs here with Dio and Appian) that Antony first sailed to Brundisium, and only when the people would not

3. See Cassius Dio 48.28.30; Appian, BC 5.63-5 (based perhaps at least partially on Asinius Pollio's lost *History*). For the general historical background of this very difficult period, see E. Shuckburgh's *Augustus*; T. Rice Holmes, *The Architect of the Roman Empire*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928) I. 103 ff., and W. W. Tarn, CAH X (1934). 51 ff.

4. In *Serm. 2.6.40*, Horace tells us that "seven, or rather eight, years" had passed since he was first introduced to Maecenas; and since *Serm. 2.6* must have been written in the year 31 or possibly early in 30, Horace's introduction could hardly have taken place before 39 B.C.

5. Appian, BC 5.92. Earlier in the same year (38 B.C.), if we may trust our source (Appian, BC 5.78 f.), it would appear that Antony had sailed to the port of Brundisium

at Octavian's invitation, but not finding him there (and perhaps disturbed by unfavorable omens), he sailed back to Greece again. All the evidence suggests that there must have been much nervous coming and going during this troubled period, and it is difficult to make a connected story out of the different accounts. Actually some older scholars like Wesseling (whom Heindorf follows) had proposed the abortive conference of 38 B.C. as the occasion for Horace's journey. Here we are on completely insecure ground, but as Palmer (for example) has pointed out, if we accept Appian's account at all, there is no reason for thinking that anyone came to meet Antony on this occasion.

6. Dio 48.54; Appian, BC 5.93-4; Plutarch, *Ant.* 35.

receive him did he proceed to Tarentum. But this detail here seems to be out of its historical context, and must belong to an account of the negotiations of 38 B.C. — and so Tarn and Rice Holmes⁷ have taken it.

And yet, notwithstanding these difficulties, most scholars, on the conviction that Horace's journey was made in the spring (for thus the night on the canal, with the frogs and gnats, would be more plausible), have attempted to link it with the Peace of Tarentum: so Kirchner, Franke, Orelli (all editions), Dillenburger, Ritter, MacLeane, Müller, Krüger, Stemplingher (*RE*, s.v. *Horatius*), Kiessling-Heinze, Hayes-Plaistow, Teuffel, Dupouy, Lejay, Villeneuve, Gow, Greenough, Latsch, Vollmer, Campbell, Rostagni.

From the historical evidence, however, when all is said, even if we could logically exclude hypothesis I (40 B.C.), it is extremely difficult to choose with any certainty between II (38 B.C.) and III (37 B.C.). Horace himself is usually far from generous with those historical details that would help the harassed scholar; but in this satire, the clues he gives us about the season of the year — the frogs and gnats on the one hand, and the rains and the fire on the other — would actually appear to be contradictory. After considering the different views, Palmer sums up the case for II:⁸

The chilly evening and the fire of branches with leaves on, vs. 81; the heavy rains, vs. 95: these suit autumn better than early spring.

And Gow puts the case on behalf of theory III:⁹

The choice between these views turns on the question whether frogs croak loudly (see l.14) in Italy in the fall of the year. On this topic, I have made enquiries from some distinguished naturalists who are well acquainted with frogs in general and with those of S. Italy in particular. They agree that, though a frog may give an occasional croak as late as August, frogs do not croak in concert except from about February to April, i.e., in the breeding-season and for some weeks af-

terwards (see *Class. Rev.* 1901, p. 117). This fact seems to show conclusively that Hor. must have travelled in the spring.

These are the reasons, such as they are, which have convinced many scholars. And yet, if we accept theory III, how are we to explain the fact that Maecenas and his party go to Tarentum by way of the circuitous sea-coast route, instead of taking the Appian way directly from Beneventum through Venusia to Tarentum? The sources all seem to suggest that Tarentum was the appointed place of the meeting; and Plutarch's remark that Antony's ships had intended to put in at Brundisium, even if we do not reject it with Tarn, Rice Holmes and others, would not alter this fact.

If we accept theory II, Maecenas' mission to Athens, it is easier to explain why Brundisium was the end of the journey for Horace. But we are still faced with the difficulty of reconciling the presence of frogs and gnats with the colder weather; and also, from our historical sources, it would seem that the nature of Maecenas' journey would not require the presence of other delegates. To sum up, the list of the delegates fits the first reconciliation (of 40 B.C.), the actual route of the journey would suit Maecenas' trip to Athens (in 38), and the season of the year would best fit in with the Peace of Tarentum (in 37). And as the bewildered scholar turns from the arguments of the proponents of one theory to those of another, there is the gnawing doubt that this, after all, is poetry and not history: our author is Horace, not Livy or Tacitus.

A further complication arises if we are to take seriously Porphyron's statement: *Lucilio hac satyra aemulatur Horatius.*¹⁰ F. Marx and G. C. Fiske have made us more aware of Horace's dependence on Lucilius' *Iter Siculum*; and one suspects that much more *aemulatio* would be in evidence if we had more of Lucilius' text. At any rate, if Horace is here consciously imitating Lucilius, then there would be further reason to doubt the historicity of some of the details as, e.g., of the *agon* between the two *scurrae*, Sarmentus and Cicirrus — for it is difficult to imagine the two buffoons making jokes about an *equus ferus* simply because they

7. Cf. Rice Holmes, *op. cit.*, 112 f.; Tarn CAH X (1934) 172.

8. See his edition (London 1883) 172.

9. *Satires: Book I* (Cambridge 1901), p. 70. Lejay, Latsch, and others suggest that the *udos ramos* (81) must have been green, thus suggesting springtime — and this is not unlikely. But that the size of the *macros turdos* (72) is also evidence of the spring is too far-fetched, as Cartault and Herrmann have already pointed out.

10. Ed. Holder, p. 255.6 ff. On Lucilius, see E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin III*, p. 30 ff. (based on the edition of F. Marx, I, pp. 9 ff.).

knew that Lucilius had made one about a rhinocerus in his third book¹¹, and perhaps even of Horace's adventure with the *puer mendax* in the villa near Trivicum (82-85).¹²

Our evidence is indeed meager, and there is little likelihood that very much more will be forthcoming. But two further possible interpretations should, I think, be considered. The first is the possibility that the *iter Brundisium* is based (at least partially) upon a reconciliation between Antony and Octavian, perhaps at Brundisium, that has not been recorded in our historical sources. For if there were two such reconciliations between the years 40 and 37, there may well have been more.

But there is still another possibility. In view of the meagerness of our historical sources, and considering what seem to be in Horace conflicting details, can we be sure that the satire is not simply a *poetic fiction*, a composite picture perhaps of journeys made at different times and bound together as a *jeu d'esprit* in imitation of Lucilius? In composing such a piece, Horace might perhaps have put himself and all of Maecenas' literary circle on the great journey to the Peace of 40 B.C. On this "journey" the typical things would happen: Horace would suffer from dysentery and sore eyes, Vergil from indigestion. And recited before Maecenas and his circle some time before the year 35 (the date of publication of the first book of *Satires*), in a version perhaps a little fuller than the one we now have, the poem would be amusing in view of the many similar journeys Maecenas and his *docta cohors* had made to South Italy. In such accounts, as those who travel on the Continent are well aware, what is *ben trovato* (an amusing incident that *might* have happened) is sometimes far more interesting than what is true. And further, from Maecenas' point of view, the prudent use of fiction in such a delicate matter would be further proof, if any were needed, of how completely trustworthy Horace

could be in connection with that more serious side of Maecenas' life, his political relations with Octavian. Gibbon's hypothesis, therefore, may not be far from the truth and may help to explain the somewhat flat and commonplace quality of much of the poem.

There still remain, it must be admitted, certain small details in the poem which do convey "an impression of historicity", and hence present some difficulty against the point of view I am proposing: e.g., the unexplained departure of L. Varius Rufus, *flentibus amicis* (93). Why did Varius have to leave the company at Canusium? This surely must reflect an actual incident which took place on some real journey and may have been familiar to all the company. Perhaps our text may even have been abridged at this point.¹³ But the apparent authenticity of this detail, whose significance has now completely escaped us, need not force us to abandon our skepticism with regard to the poem as a whole.

In any case, my feeling is that it is a useless task to attempt to assign any specific date to the events of the *Journey to Brundisium*, or to try to sort out details that might be (a) historically true, (b) pure fiction, (c) imitations of Lucilius, (d) plausible "poetic coloring" (as, e.g., perhaps the gnats, the frogs, and the rain-washed roads).

Most scholars have long given up the attempt to discover the historical nucleus of the famous satire on the Bore (*Serm. 1.9*). Perhaps a similar approach to the *Iter Brundisium* may give us a deeper insight into Horace's sense of humor, as well as a keener appreciation of a literary genre, the *iter*, which is perhaps still little understood.¹⁴

HERBERT A. MUSURILLO, S. J.

ST. ANDREW-ON-HUDSON
POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

11. Cf. Lucilius, frag. 109-110 (Warmington). It is a question whether or not for Horace the term *equis ferus* actually did mean "rhinoceros" instead of the usually accepted "unicorn"; such a meaning would make the passage more reminiscent of Lucilius and would fit in better with the rough humor of the *agon*.

12. In this connection we should also mention Tenney Frank's suggestion, CP 15 (1920) 293, that Horace's Heliodorus (2) is really to be identified with the tutor of Octavian named Apollodorus. If this is right, it is clear that a vein of fiction enters into the satire right from the first lines.

13. The transmission of the text of *Serm. 1.5* is very good; the only difficulty is the frequency of abrupt changes or lacunae in the thought which may suggest editorial (i.e. Horace's own) abridgement. The opening, for example, is extremely abrupt: Horace does not tell us who the *nos* are; the *comites* must include more than Heliodorus. The cause of Varius' departure would be expected after 92 (which I should prefer to delete with Bentley; the Scholia do not seem to know the line). The final line of the Satire also seems to come unexpectedly and abruptly, and the pretext of *finis chartae* seems quite implausible.

14. For another possibly fictitious *iter*, compare Catullus, *Carm. 4* (*Phasellus ille*) — if, with some scholars, we are to take Catullus' yacht as a mere miniature or *objet d'art*, about which Catullus is inventing a journey in the manner of the Alexandrian *ekphrasis*. For a discussion (though inadequate) of the poem, see A. L. Wheeler,

REVIEWS

A New Greek Reader. By ALSTON HURD CHASE and HENRY PHILLIPS, JR. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954. Pp. x, 324; 140 (vocabularies). \$5.00.

In capturing the imagination of the beginning student of Greek and in whetting his appetite for more, the first passages an instructor selects for connected reading are surely of vital importance. It is the hope of the editors of *A New Greek Reader* that their book "may give the beginner some conception of the interest, the beauty, and the wisdom of the greatest prose writers of Greece." They have chosen selections, varying in length from eight lines to several pages, from Herodotus, Hippocrates, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Lysias, Demosthenes, Aristotle, the Septuagint and New Testament, Apollodorus, and Plutarch. For each author there is a biographical introduction, made vivid by a variety of lively details. The notes to the texts are printed all together at the end of the book. There is a vocabulary of Greek words and one of proper names.

The selections cover a wide range of subjects, mostly historical, political, or philosophical, and should happily accomplish the twofold purpose of the editors of interesting the modern student and of affording some idea of Greek thought and culture. The passages from Aristotle, for example, are wisely culled from three representative works, the *Politics*, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and the *Poetics*. It may be somewhat unfortunate for the sake of current interest and variety of topic that twenty-one and a half of the twenty-six pages devoted to Herodotus are concerned with battles. It is surely to be regretted that Lucian made no appeal to the sense of humor either of the editors or their students; for the lighter touch, the more whimsical and

satirical side of the Greeks is scarcely to be found in the Reader.

A New Greek Reader should be helpful in first year courses and, in secondary schools, for the second year as well. Its usefulness beyond the first year in college, in spite of its generous bulk, is seriously, probably fatally, impaired since the text of the *Apology of Socrates* is given only in very abbreviated form. It was no doubt the intention of the editors to provide no more than a brief taste of Plato, a preview of reading pleasures yet to come. None the less, it would be good to have available for the student one Greek masterpiece printed in full.

It is clear from the notes that the beginning student, for whom the Reader is intended, will have to be an outstanding one. The selections are unsimplified and unaltered, and yet for some of the most difficult passages — difficult for readers at any level — little help in unraveling the complexities of the text is given. In the case of a number of the authors, notably Thucydides, the entries consist almost solely of translations of the more trying parts of the passage. It does not require a long-experienced teacher to know that the transfer of these gems of English from the back to the main body of the book will be swift and automatic. Their expediency is sweet but short-lived; they are an incomplete aid in understanding the Greek and in easing the encounter with the same problem later. More attention could have been paid perhaps in the introductions or at the beginning of each section of the notes to matters of style and characteristic forms of expression. This information might help the student to know what to expect from the Greek and to bridge the rapid transitions from one author to another, especially since the selections cover a wide diversity of styles and run in time through almost seven centuries. There is included, however, a convenient summary of the Ionic Greek of Herodotus.

Of no small interest to the student is the price of the Reader — \$5.00. This is too much to pay for a paper bound job of offset printing. One is sympathetically aware of the high costs of printing today and of the many difficulties to be surmounted in publishing scholarly books. In this instance one might be more resigned to the price if the Reader were well printed. At the very start the poorly typed Table of Contents creates an impression of haste and is an indication that a few more pains throughout the book would have been worth the effort and

Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry (Berkeley 1934) 98 ff., with the literature cited. It was perhaps from the Alexandrian *ekphrasis*, especially as a technique for describing imaginary places, that the *iter-form* is to be derived. On this exercise, see Theon, *Progymn.* 11 (pp. 118 ff. Spengel); Aphantinus, *Progymn.* 12 (pp. 46 ff. Spengel). Despite the efforts of M. Dibelius to discover an "itinerary-form" in the Acts of the Apostles (*Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, ed. H. Greeven [Göttingen: 1951] 169), it is extremely difficult to find relevant parallels for this period.

would have saved misprints. Much more serious is the uneven quality of the Greek text itself. The spacing between letters and words is irregular, and some pages are more lightly inked than others. Breathing signs, accents, and subscript characters are often illegible. The lower part of letters is frequently indistinct, and many letters are broken.

It is to be hoped that such a useful and much needed book as *A New Greek Reader* will undergo many editions and that these technical problems can by various means be solved. Classicists will certainly thank the editors for their initiative and hard work in compiling the Reader and for their service to the teaching of Greek.

MARY LOUISE CARLSON LORD

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War. Translated by REX WARNER. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1954. Pp. 553; 4 maps at end. \$1.00.

This translation, by a well-known Hellenist, is certain to have a wide circulation, and will no doubt aid the cause of Thucydides and of the classics generally. Its bright, alert appearance will attract many, and there is something to be said for new translations, even when good ones are already available, since they present the author afresh, as it were, and stimulate the public interest. Readers of this journal will ask whether they should recommend it to students or use it in their courses in ancient history and classical literature. Does it possess features of sufficient excellence to make it first choice ahead of Richard Crawley's standard version, available in both the Everyman and Modern Library editions?

Mr. Warner, in his candid preface, would not pretend to have improved on Crawley and offers the reader only the merit of modernity. The present reviewer must regretfully follow Mr. Warner in his opinion that Crawley still holds the field, despite having written nearly eighty years ago. Warner himself would recognize, I think, that his very modernity is not an unmixed blessing. Crawley had the great advantage, denied to Warner through no fault of his own, of the Victorian rhetorical style, which enabled him to approximate naturally the tension and nerve of Thucydides' epigrams and antitheses. Our ideas of "great English" have changed, and, Sir Winston Churchill apart, it is hard to think of

any writers on history or politics by whom Thucydides' "old-fashioned wilful beauty" would be carried lightly. However, Warner's practice of putting into footnotes remarks that he thinks Thucydides would so have conceived is an interesting experiment.

Let us consider a sample from the Funeral Oration of Pericles (2.39.1) in both versions.

If we turn to our military policy, there also we differ from our antagonists. We throw open our city to the world, and never by alien acts exclude foreigners from any opportunity of learning or observing, although the eyes of an enemy may occasionally profit by our liberality; trusting less in system and policy than to the native spirit of our citizens; while in education, where our rivals from their very cradles by a painful discipline seek after manliness, at Athens we live exactly as we please, and yet are just as ready to encounter every legitimate danger. In proof of this it may be noticed.... (Crawley)

Then there is a great difference between us and our opponents, in our attitude towards military security. Here are some examples: Our city is open to the world, and we have no periodical deportations in order to prevent people observing or finding out secrets which [that is meant] might be of military advantage to the enemy. This is because we rely, not on secret weapons, but on our own real courage and loyalty. There is a difference, too, in our educational systems. The Spartans, from their earliest boyhood, are submitted to the most laborious training in courage; we pass our lives without all these restrictions, and yet are just as ready to face the same dangers as they are. Here is a proof of this:.... (Warner)

Warner has sought a more conversational, less formal tone, but I submit that he has achieved his clean smoothness at the risk of being somewhat colorless. Pericles, in him, does not attain his deserved stature. The beginning of the second sentence, and the final words of my sample, are, in their prosaic, expository way, wholly unrepresentative of Thucydides' bold declamation; nor does the translator sustain the flow of Crawley's masculine strides and long phrases. Atomic-age modernity has also, it seems "secret weapons" for "preparations in secret."

Space precludes further illustrations, but there are also serious objections in matters of form. Traditional chapter-numbers are lacking, and verification of references is therefore extremely tiresome (there are indeed modern

"chapters," but for these no table of contents): lecturers will note that they must refer their students to the "Warner page"! There is no index: Crawley's index, not only of names but of subjects, is in Everyman (*not* Modern Library). However, Warner's practice of putting into footnotes remarks that he thinks Thucydides would so have conceived is worthy of imitation.

It will be replied that criticism of the style is subjective, and that in any case students will more readily accept a translation in current English; more, that the objections to the form are pedantic. It is true that if the translation maintained the highest standards of accuracy, a case might be made for its general use by teachers. Attention must therefore be invited to the following points:

P. 21 (1.15.1): "The smallest ones being the first to fall" (wrong also in Crawley) should be "and especially those who had not enough land at home." Warner claims Hobbes as a source; Hobbes would have helped.

P. 23 (1.20.3): The famous *lochos* was not "called 'Pitane,'" but was "from Pitane."

P. 63 (1.91.3): Warner wrongly follows BCE-FM in docking Habronichus of his rough breathing.

P. 66 (1.96.2): The original assessment of the Delian League was, according to all MSS, 460 talents; "400" may be a misprint.

P. 69 (1.103.1): "After ten years' fighting" should be "after nine years' fighting [i.e. in the tenth year]."

P. 88 (1.136.4): If Warner would translate the MSS, he means not "I am at the mercy of people much less strong than you are," (as Smith's Loeb translation) but "I may perhaps suffer wrong from you, weaker though you are than I" — which is indeed nonsense, so read *asthenesteros*.

P. 171: The passage in the footnote, containing 3.17, is probably spurious, and is so noted in the Oxford Text, which Warner does not always use. He mentions no texts as his sources, but from observation of Book 1 I infer that he uses mostly Hude and Loeb, following neither slavishly.

P. 182 (3.38.4): Not "You have become regular speech-goers, and as for action, you merely listen to accounts of it," but "You only stare gaping at speeches, and only hear about deeds." Some way must be found to catch Thucydides' wordplay, for one *ought* to listen to speeches

and to observe deeds.

P. 208 (3.82.2): War is not a "stern" but a "violent" teacher, and it levels most men's "passions" (Hobbes rightly for *orgas*), not their "minds."

P. 211 (3.84.): This chapter has been rightly condemned as spurious since antiquity, and is so noted in the texts cited; Crawley, too, erred in not bracketing it.

P. 363 (5.105.3): "Simplicity" (Crawley, Warner) does not translate *apeirokakon*, "innocence from suffering," "inexperience in adversity."

P. 427 (6.96.2): Thucydides says that Epipolae is "entirely visible as you look inward (*esō*)," not "all within sight from inside," which would require *esōthen*.

P. 500 (8.23.5): Warner did not use the latest evidence for his "the troops also which were on the ships;" it is now known (cf. the Jones-Powell Oxford Text of 1942) that Thucydides wrote "the infantry of the allies."

Some of these inaccuracies are more serious than others, and no version is perfect. The final verdict seems to be that, welcome as are new opportunities for the world to read Thucydides, the present translation does not otherwise compensate for its failure to match the strength and dignity of Crawley.

MORTIMER CHAMBERS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Handbook in the History of Philosophy. By ALBERT E. AVEY. ("College Outline Series," No. 90.) New York: Barnes & Noble, 1954. Pp. xvi, 320. \$1.50.

In 280 pages of text Professor Avey of Ohio State University attempts to locate in time and place all the chief thinkers from 3500 B. C. to the present day, and to review the fundamental tenets of each. It is not surprising, then, that Avey's volume suffers from the usual defect of "review books," a truly awesome degree of condensation, as disagreeable as a dinner reduced to a single capsule. I shall confine this brief notice to the first five of the twelve chapters, in which Avey manages to get from 3500 B.C. to 662 A.D. in 75 pages, containing notices of 149 persons or documents.

The order of presentation is strictly chronological, producing such curiosities as the sandwiching of Deutero-Isaiah between Anaximenes

and Pythagoras (p. 12), and of Job between Pyrrho of Elis and Epicurus (39). Even the most important figures in the history of thought must be treated in a few pages: Aristotle in six and one-half, Plato in five, Socrates in one and one-half, and Jesus and Paul in less than one page apiece. Despite the extreme shortage of space at Avey's disposal, he has given us five pages on various primitive Egyptian and Near Eastern speculations (3-7), and some useless tidbits about the Greek Philosophers: e.g., that few fragments are preserved of Hippo of Elis (19), or that Strato of Lampsacus died of a lingering disease (42).

Avey appears to share Aristotle's idea that the earlier philosophers were striving to attain the doctrines held by the latter. At least, he informs us (14) that the true interpretation of Parmenides' thought was revealed by the Law of Conservation of Energy.

There are few downright errors of fact in the first seventy-five pages, but the whole account of ancient philosophy is terribly bare, and would mislead the elementary student at whom it is aimed. Avey rather prides himself on his "crude actuality" (viii); that phrase describes the style of his book well.

At the end of the book there are ten pages listing the various philosophers by schools, and four pages of bibliography. No book on Plato is cited, and Oates' *Stoic and Epicurean Philosophers* is referred to as though it were a history of those schools. There is an elaborate, amazingly accurate index.

HERBERT S. LONG

HAMILTON COLLEGE

BRIEF NOTICES

C. M. BOWRA. Problems in Greek Poetry. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1953. Pp. xii, 171. \$4.25.

There are ten Problems: "Xenophanes on Songs at Feasts," "Xenophanes and the Olympian Games," "The Proem of Parmenides," "The Daughters of Asopus," "Pindar, Pythian II," "The Epigram of the Fallen of Coronea," "Sophocles on his own Development," "Plato's Epigram on Dion's Death," "Aristotle's Hymn to Virtue," "Erinna's Lament for Baucis." This is a good representation of the strongest side of Bowra's scholarship: close analysis of short passages, with plenty of parallels cited to illustrate sense and linguistic usage.

All reprints, gathered together from six different sources, these essays are a useful collection of sound minor contributions to the elucidation of Greek poetry.

Cornell University

G. M. Kirkwood

PHILIP VELLACOTT (trans.). Euripides, Three Plays: Hippolytus, Iphigenia in Tauris, Alcestis. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1953. Pp. 165. \$0.50. (Penguin Classics, L31.)

This is a worthy addition to the Penguin series of translations. The three plays of Euripides are here presented in language which is simple and direct, natural, and perceptive. These versions of the plays, in which both modernisms and archaisms have been avoided, are both very readable and credible, while at the same time the requisite tone of dignity and seriousness has been maintained. Though not attempting literal exactness or correspondence, the translator has achieved a high degree of fidelity in rendering the original, and his transcription of the essential meaning of Euripides is marked by real sensitivity. I regret only that he has chosen to render the dialogue passages in prose—a procedure which has some advantages, and may be plausibly defended, but seems nevertheless to entail a loss. In his translation of lyric passages, Vellacott is at his best and the result is unusually fine, often achieving effects of great beauty.

The introduction, even though of brief compass, is excellent. The translator's discussion of the period and of various aspects of Euripides' work and thought is illuminating and stimulating, and should provide to the student a helpful background for understanding and appreciating the plays. His comments on the three plays he has translated are acute, and could profitably have been expanded. It would especially have been desirable for him to have elaborated further his valuable, but all too brief suggestions to those who may undertake dramatic production of Euripides' dramas, particularly since his versions of the plays would lend themselves to performance.

Bucknell University

Harold W. Miller

B.B. TRAWICK. World Literature. I: Greek, Roman, Oriental and Medieval Classics. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1953. Pp. viii, 280. \$1.50. (College Outline Series.)

Of making compendia there is no end. They probably do little real harm since the people who read them never dream of reading the original books described in these manuals. The present volume packs a great deal of information into small space: the main outlines of the literatures listed, dates, names, bibliography, notes, mythology, quiz and examination questions, and indexes. The chief fault I find with it is that the author works too hard at emphasizing the shortcomings of the books discussed. What student can be attracted to read a book whose bad points are so heavily underlined?

Some of the judgments made are incorrect: the description of the shield of Achilles in Homer should not be called dull; Theophrastus' History of Plants and Theoretical Botany cannot be called of "little interest today." The Georgics are not, baldly, "a propagandistic work." Sulmo is not in "North Italy." It is not true that Petronius "neither condones nor condemns vice"; the total effect of the Satyricon for me is an unmistakable condemnation of decadence. Vulgar Latin is not "more clipped, more careless, less grammatically correct" except to pedantic purists but a development of Latin in its own right and with its own rules.

Proportion is sometimes awry: Nonnos is not mentioned, but the Homeric Battle of Frogs and Mice receives almost a page. Secondary sources are much used,

and quotations taken from them are not always credited to the originator. No translations, even the most famous, are listed. A few has-beens and never-weres are included in the bibliographies. The style can scarcely avoid, I suppose, the pattern of "Rome rose. Greece fell." Yet the book will be useful to those who need it; much devoted labor has gone into it, and it will no doubt sell widely.

University of Kansas

L. R. Lind

CORA MASON. *Socrates: The Man Who Dared to Ask*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1953. Pp. xii, 165. \$2.75.

Dr. Mason reconstructs in simple, clear language for readers of high school and early college age the contemporary environment which probably influenced the development of Socrates' personality from the cradle to the grave. Although the author draws both from ancient sources (particularly Plato and Xenophon) and modern scholars (Burn's *Pericles and Athens*, Burnet's notes in his editions of Plato's dialogues, and the second volume of Jaeger's *Paideia*), she of course is compelled to fill in gaps freely from her imagination. Stressing Socrates as a searcher for Truth and the Good, she slights, and almost skips, his pedagogical ability and the tremendous impact he had on numerous followers.

Scholars may feel that Dr. Mason has treated rather superficially the influence of the Sophists on Socrates and the reasons for bringing Socrates to trial. The "biography" in general, however, can be recommended highly to the audience for which it was written.

The attractiveness of the volumes is enhanced by ten plates (black-figured vases, terra-cotta figurines, and stone carvings) depicting both the leisured upper classes and the craftsmen.

Westminster College

Robert G. Hoerber

REINHOLD MERKELBACH. *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1954. Pp. xi, 255. DM 24. (Zetemata, Heft 9.)

Merkelbach's highly specialized monograph is a distinguished and fresh contribution to our knowledge of the sources of the Greek Alexander Romance—that amazing body of literature (largely worthless, historically) which grew up after the Conqueror's death and, passing under the name of Callisthenes, ultimately buried his true personality in legend.

Of the two main sources, Merkelbach distinguishes a core, essentially Hellenistic in date, which is close to the Cleitarchus tradition, with various startling descriptions added. The second main source is a conglomeration of pseudo-historical letters: (1) rhetorical letters, about 100 B.C., purportedly written by members of Alexander's expedition, (2) Alexander's supposed letters, altogether fascinating, to Aristotle and Olympias concerning his wonderful adventures in India and at the end of the world, (3) writings (from papyri and literary tradition) concerning Alexander's conversations with the Indian Gymnosopists and his last days, Hellenistic in date.

These two main sources, says Merkelbach, were put together about 300 A.D., with additional new inventions, by an uneducated individual who, among other things, was pretty ignorant of geography. The extraordinary success of his book, which gave a childish posterity its

idea of Alexander for a millennium, stands in sharp contrast, of course, to the writer's merit as an author.

Brown University

C. A. Robinson, Jr.

BENJAMIN DEAN MERITT, H. T. WADE-GERY, MALCOLM FRANCIS MCGREGOR. *The Athenian Tribute Lists. Volume IV*. Princeton, New Jersey: The American School of Classical Studies, 1953. Pp. xii, 278. \$10.00.

The size and price of this Index volume may seem extraordinary, but so are its contents and its value. With it the proper use of the preceding volumes (see CW 45 [1951-52] 230-231) is made possible and an informed study of classical Athens can be undertaken. The volume contains, in addition to a General and a Greek Index, some brief but important Addenda and Corrigenda, and a Bibliography on the Tribute Lists and related documents, ranging from 1752 to 1953, and arranged in chronological order. Although I have used the volume extensively, I have not found any omissions or mistakes, but Meritt has kindly called to my attention that Smiky-thos (pp. 117 and 209) should be listed as "epistates of Akamantis."

As this is the last volume of a great work, it is proper that we should express our gratitude and our admiration to all those connected with this publication, and our pride that such a work should have been undertaken and carried to completion in this country. May it encourage and stimulate further studies.

Princeton University

A. E. Raubitschek

FRANK BURR MARSH. *A History of the Roman World from 146 to 30 B.C.* Revised by H. H. SCULLARD. London: Methuen, 1953. Pp. xi, 467; 5 maps. 30s. (Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World, No. 5; American distributor, Macmillan Co., New York.)

When the first edition of this important history appeared in 1935, it was acclaimed by reviewers on both sides of the Atlantic as a lucid and unprejudiced account of Rome's most fateful years. In the nearly two decades since then many of Marsh's ideas, and especially his emphasis on constitutional matters, have become part of every Roman historian's inheritance. In some 38 pages of additional notes to this second edition, Scullard has attempted to perform two tasks: to bring the bibliography and new evidence up-to-date, and to supplement the original text where it was found to be overly abrupt or to present alternative views where Marsh's have been criticized. For example, Scullard has presented Last's (and the more generally accepted) view of the composition of the tribes in the second century B.C. in a long note to p. 19, and he has met Mattingly's complaint of too great compression by an expanded account of Pompey's eastern settlement at p. 157. Similar valid criticisms by other scholars have been met in the same commendable and constructive spirit.

Princeton University

Frank C. Bourne

O. DAMSTÉ (ed.). M. Tullius Cicero, *Epistulae Selectae. Met Inleiding en Aantekeningen*. 2nd ed.; Groningen and Djakarta: J. B. Wolters, 1953. Pp. 133 and 36. 2.90 fl. (Antieke Cultuur.)

This second edition of Damsté's selections from Cicero's correspondence is skillfully organized. Only the

first part of Cicero's life is now treated in the brief introduction; his career from 65 B. C. on is presented through the Latin letters themselves and the Dutch narrative connecting them. Along with the change from the introduction of the first edition (1928) "some 20 letters . . . have been replaced by the same number of others," and the notes appear at the end of the book — or as a separate pamphlet. One would have expected a little more grammatical explanation in the notes and a little less translation, but the renderings are always felicitous.

The 67 selections, most of them complete letters and several from Cicero's correspondents, are eminently successful; they offer probably as detailed a picture of Cicero in his public and private life as could be done in the space available. There is even a Latin *addendum* with the story of Cicero's death: Livy's account as preserved in the Elder Seneca (*Suas*. 6.17).

Dr. Damsté has kept abreast of recent scholarship on Cicero's Letters; and, although he cites Carcopino's *Les secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron* with laudatory adjectives in his new preface, fortunately he seems to have been circumspect in his use of the work.

University of Chicago

Edward L. Bassett

H. E. GOULD AND J. L. WHITELEY (edd.). *Vergil, Aeneid, Book Eight*. London: Macmillan and Co.; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1953. Pp. xxviii, 163. \$1.00. (Modern School Classics.)

This is another of the editions of single books of the *Aeneid* which can be very satisfactorily used in introducing students to Virgil. It has the usual features of an introduction, with a brief account of Virgil's life and works, and in this case with a summary of all the books of the *Aeneid* so that the placing and function of this one in the whole story are no trouble to the student; good notes; and a vocabulary.

In addition to these things are two sections especially to be noticed: (1) the explanation of hexameter verse in the introduction; this is the simplest and most lucid discussion of the verse form that can possibly be imagined, and anyone should be able to learn from it the structure and the scansion of the hexameter even without external help; (2) an appendix containing seven brief selections from Livy, Ovid, and Horace which have to do with themes in the legends and history of Rome that are relevant to the matter in Book 8 (e.g. Livy's account of Cacus and Hercules). Each of these has its own notes immediately following.

All in all a very nice edition, and to be recommended for classroom use.

Carleton College, Ottawa

Ellenor Swallow

A. H. NASH-WILLIAMS (ed.). *Hannibal in Defeat: Selections from Livy XXV-XXX*. With Introduction and Notes. London: Macmillan and Co.; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1953. Pp. xxvi, 137. \$1.00 (Modern School Classics.)

Here is another of the slim volumes of extracts from a classical author, intended for secondary-school use, which the British have long been putting out, and which are much more practical, even for college use, than the fuller editions of the American market. The present one concludes the story of Hannibal begun in two previous volumes by the same editor.

After a sensible introduction on the historical background there are 49 pages of Latin text, divided into 38 chapters, each provided with a brief English summary. These extracts are well chosen, and include selections from books 33, 35, 37 and 39, so as to cover Hannibal's career after Zama; the Latin is unadulterated, but occasionally skillfully abridged. The notes, filling pp. 50-110, are adequate and generally helpful, though for American students the terminology might at times appear strange. The book has three maps, eight illustrations—not always illuminating or appropriate—and a good vocabulary (though the entry "animo (1), be minded" is a puzzler).

There are a few, unimportant misprints, but serious objections can be raised only against the use of the macrons. Not employed at all in the text, it is scattered throughout the vocabulary on no discernible principle: see, e.g., the treatment of *ibi* : *alibi*, *adlocutus* : *collocutus*, *editus* : *edo*, etc.

Queens College

Konrad Gries

LOUIS KUKENHEIM. Contributions à l'histoire de la grammaire grecque, latine et hébraïque à l'époque de la renaissance. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951. Pp. x, 143.

We have here a sequel to the author's earlier work on the initial stages in the grammatical codification of the European vernaculars. He proceeds by grammatical topic ("parts of speech," "syntax," etc.) rather than chronologically, a system which has obvious advantages and disadvantages. The work is informative, if somewhat aphoristic; it should go far toward stimulating interest in a subject which is vast and ill-explored and which holds a good deal more importance and fascination to the historian of thought than many realize.

In his value judgments, Kukenheim is sometimes harsh: often the renaissance grammarians come closer to what we would call objective, economical presentation than he believes. Nor were the achievements of grammatical analysis in the post-renaissance schools so great and durable as to dwarf those of Nebrija, Erasmus, and Melanchthon in hindsight.

University of Pennsylvania Henry M. Hoenigswald

BOOKS RECEIVED

FROST, WILLIAM. *Dryden and the Art of Translation*. ("Yale Studies in English," Vol. 128.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1955. Pp. xi, 100. No price stated.

LUSCHNAT, OTTO (ed.). *Thucydidis Historiae*. Vol. I: *Libri I-II*. ("Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana," No. 1958). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1954. Pp. 24*, 202. DM 8.40.

ROSS, SIR DAVID (ed.). *Aristotle, Parva Naturalia*. A revised text with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. Pp. xi, 355. \$6.40 (40s.).

SCHUSTER, MAURITIUS (ed.). *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*. ("Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana," No. 1739.) Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1954. Pp. xxxvi, 252. DM 9.

SINGER, CHARLES, E. J. HOLMYARD, A. R. HALL (eds.). *A History of Technology*. Vol. I: From Early Times to Fall of Ancient Empires. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. Pp. lv, 827; 570 text-figures; 36 plates; 8 maps. \$23.50.